4 (2) (3)

Before the State Administrative Tribunel, Raipur

O.A. No. : 446/01 WP(S)3221/01





Applicant ... Rajiv Ratn Choubey,
S/o. Late Shri R.R. Choubey
aged about 48 years,
Superintedent - Post Matrike
Government Employees Boys Hostel,
Raigarh, (Chhattisgarh).

VERSUS

Respondents ... (1) State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Trible Welfare Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur, (Chh.)

(2) Commissioner, Schedule Cast, Schedule Tribe, Backward Class and Minority Development Department, Ravishanker University Campus, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

(3) Collector, Raigarh, Distt. Raigarh, (Chhattisgarh)

(4) Assistant Commissioner, Tribel Development, Raigarh (Chh.)

NOTARY
I. C. TIWARY
NOTARY (ADVOCATE)
Raipur Distt.
RAIPUR (M.P.) INDIA
Reg.No.-M.P.
27/12/1-98
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 19 OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS ACT 1985.

(1) Name and Address of Applicant. : As stated above.

(2) Name and Address of Respondents. : As stated above.

Contd..2..

(45)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. (S) No. 3722 of 2005

Petitioner — Rajiv Ratn Choubey

Versus

Respondents — State of Chhattisgarh & others

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri, J**

Shri Manoj K. Dubey, Advocate for the petitioner.

V. V. S. Murthy, Deputy Advocate General with Smt. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Govt. Advocate for the respondents/State.

ORDER

(Passed on this 9th day of March, 2007)

The following order of the Court is passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. The petitioner was working as Superintendent in Post Metric Government Employees Boys Hostel, Raigarh. In his place, Shri Dharmendra Singh Bais was transferred to Raigarh vide order dated 22.6.2001 (Annexure A/2) but no order regarding the placement of the petitioner was passed.
2. The Madhya Pradesh Administrative Tribunal at Raipur vide interim order dated 30.6.2001 directed to maintain status quo in regard to the position of the petitioner as it was prevailing on 29.6.2001. By virtue of the interim order the petitioner is continuing at the original place of posting.
3. Be that as it may, with the passage of time this petition has become infructuous as period of transfer is not applicable forever. At this point of time there is no question to examine the validity of the impugned order. However, the respondents are at liberty to pass appropriate orders keeping in view the public interest and administrative exigency, without insisting on compliance of the impugned transfer order.
4. In view of the above, this petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur